

**REMARKS**

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated July 29, 2008 (“*Office Action*”). At the time of the *Office Action*, Claims 1, 3-9, 11, 13-20 and 31-34 were pending and rejected. Claims 21-30 are withdrawn. Applicant has amended Claim 8, 11 and 33. Applicant has also added new Claims 35 and 36. As described below, Applicant believes all claims to be allowable over the cited references. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

**Objections**

The Examiner objects to the Specification because “element 115 is being referred to both ‘the management application 115’ and ‘computer processing system 115.’” Solely to advance prosecution, Applicant has amended the Specification by deleting “115” from the term “computer processing system 115.”

Claim 33 has been amended in accordance with the suggestion of the Examiner to correct informalities. Applicant thanks the Examiner for pointing out the informalities.

**Section 103 Rejections**

The Examiner rejects Claims 1, 3-5, 9, 11, 13-15 and 33-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,125,390 issued to Touboul (“*Touboul*”) and U.S. Patent No. 6,049,828 issued to Dev et al. (“*Dev*”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,761,502 issued to Jacobs (“*Jacobs*”). The Examiner rejects Claims 6 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Touboul*, *Dev* and *Jacobs* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,011,838 to Cox (“*Cox*”). The Examiner rejects Claims 7 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Touboul*, *Dev* and *Jacobs* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,748,098 to Grace (“*Grace*”). The Examiner rejects Claims 8 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Touboul*, *Dev* and *Jacobs* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,006,016 to Faigon et al. (“*Faigon*”). The Examiner rejects Claims 19-20 and 31-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable

over *Touboul, Dev* and *Jacobs* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,933,601 to Fanshier (“*Fanshier*”). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

**I. *Dev* does not disclose, teach, or suggest “a user-generated text-based dialogue request specifying a user defined type of context data” as recited in Claim 1.**

Claim 1 includes the limitations, “receiving, in response to the reporting of the alert condition, a user-generated text-based dialogue request **specifying a user defined type of context data** for the subject system object.” In the *Office Action*, the Examiner points to a list of alarms displayed in Figure 10 of *Dev* and argues that the above-quoted limitations are taught by the act of “clicking on the condition red.” *Office Action*, page 3. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Without conceding whether the act of “clicking on the condition red” teaches a user-generated text-based dialogue request, the alleged request of *Dev* created by clicking “Condition Red” does not **specify a user defined type of context data** as recited in Claim 1. Rather, the cited portions of *Dev* make it clear that by clicking on a particular alarm, the user may generically obtain “more information.” *Dev*, col. 15, lines 16-18. *Dev* is completely devoid of any teaching that the severity of the alarm (the alleged context data) is specified in the alleged request created as a result of clicking on the alarm. Consequently, regardless of whether “condition red” teaches a user defined type of context data as argued by the Examiner; see *Office Action*, page 14, it continues to be Applicant’s position that the alleged text-based request of *Dev* does not allow specification of the type of context data to be requested or the user to specify a user defined type of context data. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully contends that Claim 1 and each of its dependent claims are in condition for allowance. For analogous reasons, Applicant further contends that Claims 9 and 11 and each of their dependent claims are in condition for allowance.

**II. *Dev does not disclose, teach, or suggest “a user-generated text-based dialogue request textually requesting context data for the subject system object” as recited in Claim 8.***

Claim 8, as amended includes the limitations, “receiving, in response to the reporting of the alert condition, a user-generated text-based dialogue request **textually** requesting context data for the subject system object.” In the *Office Action*, the Examiner rejected a previous version of these limitations by pointing to sections of *Dev* that discuss a list of alarms for which a user can obtain more information by clicking on a particular alarm. See *Office Action*, page 10, lines 17-19 (citing *Dev*, col. 8, lines 31-37; col. 15, lines 12-29). However, these sections of *Dev* are devoid of any teaching of a “user-generated text-based dialogue request **textually** requesting context data” as recited in Claim 8. For example, while *Dev* discloses that a user may generically obtain “more information” by clicking on a particular alarm; see *Dev*, col. 15, lines 16-18, *Dev* is devoid of any teaching that the alleged request created by clicking on an alarm “textually requests context data” as recited in Claim 8. Consequently, *Dev* fails to disclose teach or suggest, receiving, in response to the reporting of the alert condition, a user-generated text-based dialogue request **textually** requesting context data for the subject system object” as recited in Claim 8. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully contends that Claim 8 is in condition for allowance. For analogous reasons, Applicant further contends that dependent Claim 35 is in condition for allowance.

**III. All Claims are in condition for allowance.**

For at least the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully contends that each and every claim is in condition for allowance. Moreover, Applicant respectfully contends that none of the deficiencies described above with respect to *Dev* are accounted for by any of the remaining references (*Touboul, Jacobs, Cox, Grace, Faigon, and Fanshier*) cited by the Examiner or by the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art.

**New Claims**

Applicant has added new Claims 35 and 36 which are fully supported by the Specification as originally filed and add no new matter. Applicant respectfully contends that references cited by the Examiner fail to disclose, or even teach or suggest, either alone or in combination, the combination elements recited in these claims. As one example, Claims 35 and 36 each depend from an allowable independent claim, as discussed above. As another example, none of the references cited by the Examiner teach that “the user-generated text-based dialogue request textually requests the user defined type of context data” as recited in Claim 35. Further, none of the references cited by the Examiner teach that “the context message contains the user defined type of context data specified in the request” as recited in Claim 36.

**No Waiver**

Applicant has merely discussed example distinctions from the references cited by the Examiner. Other distinctions may exist, and Applicant reserves the right to discuss these additional distinctions in a later Response or on Appeal, if appropriate. By not responding to additional statements made by the Examiner, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Examiner’s additional statements. The example distinctions discussed by Applicant is sufficient to overcome the Examiner’s rejections.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of all pending claims.

If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the Examiner is invited to contact Luke K. Pedersen, Attorney for Applicant, at the Examiner's convenience at (214) 953-6655.

The Examiner is authorized to charge the amount of **\$104.00** for the addition of two dependent claims. Please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to  
**Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.**

Respectfully submitted,  
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
Attorneys for Applicant



Luke K. Pedersen  
Reg. No. 45,003

Date: 10-29-08

Correspondence Address:

at Customer No. **05073**